REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of August 28, 2007.

In the August 28, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Gong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,574). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, as discussed in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that Gong fails to teach or suggest an operation of *forcing* at least one request originating from an application of a second family to include a mark associated with the second family of applications as recited in independent claims 1 and 14, and *forcing* at least one request originating from an application of the second family to exclude a mark associated with a first family of applications as recited in independent claims 6 and 15.

As discussed throughout the present application, the present invention relates to a technique of communicating between first and second units in a communications network, with the first unit comprising applications belonging to a first family and to a second family having a lower degree of confidence than the first family. When a request originating from an application of the second family is transmitted over the network to the second unit, the method forces the request to include a mark associated with the second family, or forces the request to exclude a mark associated with the first family. By doing this, the second unit can more readily ascertain the nature and origin of the application from which the request has been made, thus reducing the risk of the second unit being adversely affected by illegitimate applications, such as Trojan horses and the like.

These features are recited at least in independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 15. Specifically, independent claim 1 explicitly recites a method for communicating between first and second units including the step of *forcing* at least one request originating from an application of a second family to include a mark associated with the second family of applications, and independent claim 14 recites a communication terminal that performs this operation. Independent claim 6 recites a method for communicating between first and second units including the step of *forcing* at least one request originating from an application of the second

family to exclude a mark associated with a first family of applications, and independent claim 15 recites a communication terminal that performs this operation. The dependent claims recite further details relating to these features.

Gong teaches a relay server for unassigned applets. Specifically, column 1, line 62 through column 2 line 13 of Gong teaches that a developer of a Java applet can choose to sign, or not to sign, the applet before making it available from a Web server. Such a signature enables to identify the developer as being the source of the applet. Thus, some applets are signed and some are not signed. Gong then teaches that, if a user of a personal computer downloads from an ISP server system an unsigned applet requiring network resources not present within the ISP server, these resources will be refused by the Web browser of the user's personal computer. In order to allegedly solve this problem, Gong teaches the use of a relay server 20 in the ISP server 12 as shown in FIG. 1 of Gong. All the requests for resources from applets, signed and not signed, are delivered to the relay server 20, and these requests are not refused by the Web browser of the user's personal computer because the relay server 20 is part of the ISP server 12.

When a request is received from an unsigned applet 24, the relay server 20 acts as a gateway for the exchanges between a remote server 16 specified by the request from the unsigned applet 24. As described column 4, lines 17-31 in relation to Fig. 3 of Gong, the ISP server 12 receives a request for resources from the applet 24 downloaded by the user computer 14 in step 54 of the processing. In step 56, ISP server 12 determines whether the applet 24 originating the request has been signed. If the applet 24 is signed, the ISP server directly relays the request to the server 16 specified by the request in step 58. If the applet 24 is unsigned, links are established between the relay server 20 and the server 16 for communication between the unsigned applet 24 and the server 16 in steps 60 and 62.

The Examiner contends that Gong allegedly teaches a method of communication between a first unit (computer 14) and a second unit (ISP server 12) via a communication network, and that requests originating from applications belonging to two families have

distinct degrees of confidence corresponding respectively to signed applications and unsigned applications. According to the Examiner, steps 56 and 58 of Gong allegedly teach a step of forcing at least one request originating from an application of the second family in the first unit (computer 14) to include a mark associated with the second family.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Gong merely teaches that the ISP server 12 determines whether the applet (from which a request is originated) is signed or unsigned. Gong therefore fails to teach or suggest any operation of forcing the request itself to include a mark associated to an application family, for example, the family of unsigned applets, or forcing the request not to include a mark associated with another application family. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Gong does not teach or suggest that the determination of the type ("signed" or "unsigned") of the applet is performed as a function of such a mark. The ISP server 12 presumably determines that the applet is signed or unsigned as a function of data stored in the memories 28, 36 of the ISP 12 while downloading the applet 24 into the computer 14 via the ISP server 12. Again, Gong does not teach or suggest any step where requests from a family of applications (for example unsigned applets) from the computer 14 would be forced to include a mark. Nowhere does Gong teach or suggest that the computer 14 performs operations for checking for the presence of the mark in requests and inserts, if necessary, such a mark in the requests.

Gong also therefore fails to teach the further features associated with the mark as recited in the dependent claims.

Hence, for at least the above reasons, Gong does not anticipate the embodiments of the present invention even as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 14 and 15. Accordingly, all claims should be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
One of Attorneys for Applicant(s)
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: November 28, 2007

CH02/ 22503297.1